

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank Examiner Tran for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on September 24, 2008. Applicants' representative Barbara A. Wilkey discussed the proposed amendments and the cited reference in general with the Examiner. Applicants have amended the claims in light of the Examiners comments. No demonstration was given, no agreement was reached, and no exhibit was shown.

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the August 14, 2008 final Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment C amends claims 1, 9-12, 14, 25, 31, 33, and 34 and cancels claims 2, 3, 27, and 32. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 4-7 and 9-26, 28-31, 33-36 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 10-19, 21-29 and 31 -35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jobs et al., U.S. Pub App. No. 2005/0149879 (hereinafter Jobs) in view of Brooks et al., U.S. Pat. No. US 6,008,809 (hereinafter Brooks). Additionally, claims 9, 20, 30, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jobs in view of Brooks as applied to claims 2, 16, 25, and 31 and further in view of Straub et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,141 (hereinafter Straub).

Jobs teaches a human interface that manages the available space of a computer display. (Abstract). Non-active tasks are minimized by reducing them in size or replacing them with a representative symbol, such as an icon, so that they occupy a minimal amount of space on the monitor's screen. (Abstract). In particular, when the user clicks on a minimized representation of a window, such as a tile in the user bar, the window manager restores it to its normal size. (Paragraph 38, FIG. 8). **In other words, Jobs merely provides a small representation of an application without functionality.**

Brooks discloses viewing multiple windows simultaneously within a dynamic window which allows a user to relate several windows shown on a display without having to repeatedly arrange and size each individual window. (Abstract). Dynamic windowing mechanism dynamically sizes each application window as it is dragged and dropped into the dynamic window causes the **application window to be sized in relation to other application windows** residing in the dynamic window. (Column 6, lines 31-42). Critical to the teachings of Brooks, **the window is minimized to a button causing the name of the dynamic window to be displayed on the button**. (FIG. 18, reference character 526; column 11, lines 47-50; column 12, lines 36-39).

Straub teaches a method for displaying a **rich multimedia document** in the same window as the desktop window. (Abstract). FIG. 5 illustrates desktop window with a **desktop viewer for displaying a document** including a channel bar and FIG. 6 illustrates **a browser** for displaying additional information about the **document** displayed in the desktop viewer. (Column 4, lines 19-24). The channel bar lists the currently selected channels denoted by channel buttons where each channel button represents a different channel corresponding to a topic of information or a different content provider. (Column 8, lines 44-57). Selecting the options button of the channel bar results in the **opening of an options window** having a menu of **options the user can select**. (Column 9, lines 11-13). For example, the user can select an **option for removing the channel bar and viewer** from the desktop, the user can select **the duration that each document or channel is displayed**; the user can also **access a channel guide** that allows the user to select **channels and documents** displayed in the viewer. (Column 9, lines 13-23). The options menu also provides navigation controls option which includes fast-forward, play, pause and reverse options to **control the viewer**. (Column 9, lines 24-32). **In other words, Straub teaches interactive functions related to the viewer, not an application**.

Claims 1, 14, and 25

In contrast, claim 1 recites

defining a sidebar of a user interface;
 requesting a application appear in a sidebar **when minimized**;
minimizing the application upon receiving a minimize command;
 revealing a tile in the sidebar to **present the minimized application in response to the minimize command and the request**, the sidebar configured to display a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications wherein

revealing the tile includes **displaying a sub-set of live-data provided by the application when not minimized and the sub-set of interactive application features provided by the application when not minimized in the tile**, wherein the sub-set of interactive applications features do not include features related to sizing or re-sizing of the tile, **wherein the sub-set of interactive application features are selected by the application** and the sub-set of interactive application features **are determined to be useful by the application when minimized**; and

persisting the revealed tile in the sidebar **when the user logs off the computing system wherein the revealed tile remains in the sidebar upon the next login of the user**

The rich minimized application has an interface that is **capable of providing important interactive features of the application even when the application is minimized**. (Page 21, paragraph 72). Many applications have some set of features that are useful to a user even when the **application window is minimized**. (Page 22, paragraph 72). The features selected by the module may be or include a sub-set of the original feature set, the entire original feature set, or additional features not included in the original feature set. (Page 22, paragraph 72).

For example, **an application such as a media player could offer controls such as play/pause and information such as song name while the application is minimized in the sidebar**. (Page 23, paragraph 76). When the user minimizes the application by clicking on the minimize button or other method, the main application window vanishes and a tile appears in the sidebar. (Page 23, paragraph 76). Advantageously, **the tile provides some information and controls that were in the main window so that the user still has access to them even though the application window is minimized**. (Page 23, paragraph 76). Other examples include a clock, a virus checker, or a list of buddies online **applications that may provide such functionality in a minimized state**. (Page 23, paragraph 77). In yet another example, illustrated in FIG. 9C, a fly-out window provides song options, a directory for further albums and artists, and other play options **despite the fact that the application is minimized**. (Page 28, paragraph 89).

However, none of the above references teach or make obvious the **"requesting an application appear in a sidebar when minimized"** and **"revealing a tile in the sidebar to represent the minimized application ... wherein revealing the tile includes displaying a sub-set of live-data provided by the application when not minimized and the sub-set of interactive application features provided by the application when not minimized in the tile,**

wherein the sub-set of interactive applications features do not include features related to sizing or re-sizing of the tile, wherein the sub-set of interactive application features are selected by the application" as recited in claim 1. As explained above, Jobs merely discloses minimizing an application with no interactive features, Brooks merely teaches that a minimized application appears as a button in a dynamic window, and Straub merely teaches an options menu for providing navigation controls option to control the viewer. Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. (*KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, U.S., 550 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)). However, in this rejection, neither the element of requesting an application appear in a sidebar when minimized nor the result of revealing a tile in the sidebar to represent the minimized application ... wherein revealing the tile includes displaying a sub-set of live-data provided by the application when not minimized and the sub-set of interactive application features provided by the application when not minimized in the tile, wherein the sub-set of interactive applications features do not include features related to sizing or re-sizing of the tile, wherein the sub-set of interactive application features are selected by the application is found in the combined art. Claims 14 and 25, as amended, include similar subject matter as claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1, 14, and 25 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 4-7, 9-13, 15-24, and 26, 28-30 depend from claims 1, 14, and 25, respectively, and are allowable for at the least the same reasons as claims 1, 14, and 25.

Claim 31

In contrast, claim 31 recites

a processor associated with a computer;
 an available feature selection module **for allowing an email application to provide one or more selected interactive features of the email application including at least a sub-set of a full feature set upon minimization of the email application** wherein the **selected interactive application features include access to new and unread email messages received by the email application while minimized;** and

a tile insertion module for **revealing a tile corresponding to the email application upon minimization** and for **displaying the selected interactive features in the tile in response to minimization of the email application,** wherein the selected interactive applications features do not include features related to sizing or re-sizing of the tile, wherein the tile insertion module reveals

the tile in a sidebar configured to host the tile within the user interface, wherein the sidebar includes a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications, **wherein the tile corresponding to the minimized application persists in the sidebar when the user logs off the computer and wherein tile corresponding to the application remains in the sidebar upon the next user login to the computer.**

An example of live-data is the email notification tile, which contains a listing of emails. (Page 18, paragraph 62; FIG. 3). As shown in FIG. 3, email notification indicates that there are two new mail messages. (Page 16, paragraph 62; FIG. 3). Correspondingly, the top two email listings are highlighted to indicate that they are new and unread. (Page 26, paragraph 62; FIG. 3).

None of the above references teach or make obvious the **"an available feature selection module for allowing an email application to provide one or more selected interactive features of the email application ... wherein the selected interactive application features include access to new and unread email messages received by the email application while minimized" and "a tile insertion module for revealing a tile corresponding to the email application upon minimization and for displaying the selected interactive features in the tile in response to minimization"** as recited in claim 31. As explained above, Jobs merely discloses minimizing an application with no interactive features, Brooks merely teaches that a minimized application appears as a button in a dynamic window, and Straub merely teaches an options menu for providing navigation controls option to control the viewer. Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. (*KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.* U.S., 550 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)). However, in this rejection, neither the **element of an available feature selection module for allowing an email application to provide one or more selected interactive features of the email application ... wherein the selected interactive application features include access to new and unread email messages received by the email application while minimized** nor the **result of a tile insertion module for revealing a tile corresponding to the email application upon minimization and for displaying the selected interactive features in the tile in response to minimization** is found in the combined art. Accordingly, claim 31 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 33-36 depend from claim 31 and are allowable for at the least the same reasons as claim 31.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Barbara A. Wilkey/

Barbara A. Wilkey, Reg. No. 62,986
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 345-7000

RMB/BAW/cjl